

Application No.: 10/669,404
Docket No.: UC0318 US NA

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Examiner's rejection in the Final Office Action dated November 21, 2007.

Status of the Claims

The pending claims are 2-7 and 10-15. Claims 8, 16 and 17 are canceled. Claims 6, 7 and 10 are amended. The independent claims are 6, 7, and 10.

Claims 2-8 and 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 8, 16, and 17 are canceled.

Claims 6, 7 and 10 are amended, without conceding the merits of the rejections, in the interests of advancing the prosecution of the amended claims, as follows:

Claim 6 is amended to recite that the electronic device is an organic light-emitting diode, as originally stated in the preamble. No new matter is introduced.

Claim 7 is amended to recite that the electronic device is selected from an organic light-emitting diode and a photodetector. Support for this can be found at page 8, lines 18-35. No new matter is introduced.

Claim 10 is amended to recite that the active material is selected from fluorescent emitters and phosphorescent emitters. No new matter is introduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poetsch et al., U.S. Patent 5,348,677 ("Poetsch"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[1] With respect to independent Claim 6, Applicant respectfully submits that Poetsch does not teach or suggest solutions for forming an active layer in an organic light-emitting diode ("OLED"). The Examiner has cited Poetsch at column 1, lines 59 and 60, as teaching that their liquid-crystalline dielectrics can be used in various electro-optical display elements. The Examiner further states that an OLED is a form of electro-optical display. Applicant respectfully submits that the electro-optical display of Poetsch is limited to various types of liquid crystal

Application No.: 10/669,404
Docket No.: UC0318 US NA

displays, and there is no suggestion of an OLED. The paragraph starting at line 59 of column 1 of Poetsch lists *only* liquid crystal displays. From the title through the last claim, the display of Poetsch is an "electro-optical liquid crystal display." Furthermore, the functions of the dielectric layer in a liquid crystal display and the active layers of an OLED are very different. One of ordinary skill in the art would not select a material from a dielectric layer in a liquid crystal display as a material which would have functionality in an OLED.

[2] With respect to independent Claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that Poetsch does not teach or suggest an electronic device selected from an OLED and a photodetector; nor does the reference teach or suggest an active material selected from fluorescent emitters, phosphorescent emitters, charge transport materials and buffer layer materials. As discussed above, the electro-optical devices of Poetsch are limited to liquid crystal displays. There is no teaching of OLEDs or of photodetectors. Furthermore, there is no teaching in Poetsch of the specific active materials recited in Applicants' Claim 7. The additives of Poetsch (column 16, line 23-40) are those designed to improve liquid crystal function and are not the same as Applicants' active materials. The Examiner has indicated that the "conductivity salt" of Poetsch is suitable as a charge transport material or a buffer layer material. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no support for this statement within Poetsch or the references cited by Poetsch. The "conductivity salts" of the Hallet et al. reference (column 16, lines 32-34) are dopants for nematic liquids. There is no suggestion of the use of these materials in charge transport layers or buffer layers in an OLED or photodetector.

[3] With respect to independent Claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that Poetsch does not teach or suggest solutions comprising the fluorinated compound recited in the claim and the organic active material recited, including fluorescent emitters, phosphorescent emitters, and charge transport materials. As discussed above, the additives of Poetsch, and specifically the "conductivity salt", do not teach or suggest charge transport materials. However, in order to further prosecution, "charge transport materials" have been deleted from Claim 10, as amended herein.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/669,404
Docket No.: UC0318 US NA

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 21 2008

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been rendered moot or overcome by the foregoing amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited for Claims 2-7 and 10-15.

Should the Examiner have questions about the content of this paper or the status of the application, she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John H. Lamming
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 34,857
Telephone: (302) 992-5877
Facsimile: (302) 892-1026

Dated: February 21, 2008